



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,883	04/24/2001	Masao Mougi	16869P025800	6133
20350	7590	07/13/2006	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			SHERR, CRISTINA O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/841,883

Applicant(s)

MOUGI ET AL.

Examiner

Cristina Owen Sherr

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 1, 2006 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-17 have been canceled. Claims 18, 19, ²⁰~~10~~, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 31 have been amended. Claims 18-32 are currently pending in this case.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-32, as currently amended, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 18-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al (US 5,892,900) in view of Horstmann (6,009,401).

6. Regarding claim 18 –

Art Unit: 3621

Ginter (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), Col. 47, lines 20-55, Col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5, (thus-may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server(See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

7. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

8. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

9. Regarding claim 19 –

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g.

Art Unit: 3621

billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

10. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

11. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations.

12. Regarding claim 20 – Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example,

Art Unit: 3621

preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

13. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations.

14. Regarding claim 21-

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a

Art Unit: 3621

communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server(See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

15. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

16. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations.

17. Regarding claim 22 –

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, line's 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data including storage which is the functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

Art Unit: 3621

18. Regarding claim 23 –

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server(See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

19. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

20. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

21. Regarding claim 24 –

Art Unit: 3621

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

22. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

23. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

24. Regarding claim 25 –

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

Art Unit: 3621

billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server(See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

25. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

26. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

27. Regarding claim 26 –

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require 'a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col.

Art Unit: 3621

197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

28. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

29. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

30. Regarding claim 27—

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col.

197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures

that will be reported to third parties)) disclose the license-issuing computer.

to disclose validation and use with respect to the claim limitations.

Art Unit: 3621

that will be reported to third parties)) disclose method for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

31. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

32. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

33. Regarding claim 28 – substantially as claimed. The differences between the above

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g.

billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col.

197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose method for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a

Art Unit: 3621

communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

34. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) show license by merchant computer.

35. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

36. Regarding claim 29 – substantially as claimed, the differences between the above Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose method for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above

Art Unit: 3621

and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

37. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) shows license by merchant computer.

38. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

39. Regarding claim 30 –

Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior); col. 47, lines 20-55; col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data including license which is the functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

Art Unit: 3621

40. Regarding claim 31, Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g. billing information) in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose method for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key (including trial use) for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific license by merchant computer and authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the server (See Fig. 1) are functionally equivalent to a license-issuing computer.

41. Horstmann (See Fig. 2,3, Col. 3, lines 1-15, Col. 4, lines 55-65) show license by merchant computer.

42. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Ginter et al because the license elements are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and use.

43. Regarding claim 32 – Ginter et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, 53a, Col. 43, lines 20-55 (user might require a method that summarizes usage information for reporting to a clearinghouse (e.g.

Art Unit: 3621

billing information), in a way that does not convey confidential, personal information regarding detailed usage behavior), col. 47, lines 20-55, col. 196, lines 45-67, Col. 197, lines 1-5 (thus may be used to implement privacy filters by, for example, preventing certain confidential user information from being written to data structures that will be reported to third parties)) disclose means for a server to issue a license to a client upon verification and issuing a license key for a product by means of a communication network involving multiple parties and restrictions placed on the transmission of user data including license which is the functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

44. Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific claim limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cristina Owen Sherr whose telephone number is 571-272-6711. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

Art Unit: 3621

46. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

47. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

COS, 07/06/06



MARY D. CHEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

unpublished applications, available through Private PAIR only.

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information